



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,151	01/30/2004	Nobuyuki Fujiwara	1339	9525

7590 09/29/2005

Mr. Loyal M. Hanson
Hanson Law Corporation
P.O. Box 430
Fallbrook, CA 92088-0430

EXAMINER

HOLZEN, STEPHEN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3644

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/769,151	Applicant(s) FUJIWARA ET AL.	
	Examiner Stephen A. Holzen	Art Unit 3644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6,14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/30/2004</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

19

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's amendments filed 9/14/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 8 and 13 have been fully considered and overcome the previous rejections. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Sepp (3,931,945).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sepp (3,931,945). Sepp discloses a rotating parachute having vanes (11), a circular band (10), and outer skirt band (17), inner suspension lines (16), suspension lines (15) that branch into a outer suspension line (15) and the inner suspension line (16), the suspension lines (15) converge to a swivel (14) that is a junction point for all the suspension lines, the suspension lines all have the same length.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sepp (3,931,945) in view of Case (4,863,119). Sepp discloses every aspect of the present invention except a planar reefing device. Case teaches that it is well known in the art to use planar reefing devices with a parachute having multiple suspension lines to reduce the opening shock of the parachute. (see figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to reduce opening shocks on the parachutist.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sepp (3,931,945) in view of Brownell (2001/0050323)

Sepp discloses a rotating parachute having vanes (11), a circular band (10), and outer skirt band (17), inner suspension lines (16), suspension lines (15) that branch into a outer suspension line (15) and the inner suspension line (16), the suspension lines (15) converge to a swivel (14) that is a junction point for all the suspension lines, the suspension lines all have the same length.

Sepp does not disclose lower and upper suspension lines made of different material. Brownell however does teach that it is known in the art to use suspension lines made of different materials. (see ¶0062). In the absence of any disclosed critically of using different materials, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use different materials for the upper and lower suspension lines since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin 125 USPQ 416.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
8. The examiner asserts that H. T. Stevenson (2,770,432) also reads on claims 1 and 2, and could have been used in similar 102(b) and 103(a) type rejections.
9. The examiner asserts that Barish (4,844,384) could also read on at least claims 1 and 2 in a similar manner as Stevenson and Sepp.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 8 and 9 are allowed.

11. Claims 4-6 and 14 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance (and reasons for objecting to claims 4-6 and 14): the prior art does not disclose the vent band and vent suspension lines in combination with the suspension lines and circular band having branches forming two upper and one lower suspension line.


Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen A. Holzen whose telephone number is 571-272-6903. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 571-272-7045. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sah



TERI PHAM LUU
SUPERVISORY
PRIMARY EXAMINER